

[27th February 1928]

(b) whether it is a fact that an unpassed clerk named Raghava Ayyar was appointed as sub-magistrate by a previous Collector of Chingleput district and that a matriculate revenue subordinate named D. Soundararaja Ayyangar has been appointed as sub-magistrate in the Pattukkotta taluk of the Tanjore district overlooking the claims of more qualified men;

(c) whether Government propose to put an end to such appointments by insisting upon the previous sanction of the High Court and Local Government for the same?

A.—(1) The hon. Member is referred to the lists of Revenue establishments of districts corrected up to 1st April 1927, copies of which have been placed in the Legislative Council Library. The Government have no later information and do not propose to make a special compilation. There is no rule precluding the appointment as sub-magistrate of a Government official on the ground that his educational qualification when he entered service was not higher than that of the possessor of a school final or matriculation certificate.

(2) (a) Appointments to the office of sub-magistrates are made by Collectors from the list of persons previously approved by the Board of Revenue. High Court Judges are not consulted as they are not in a position to know anything about the work of the class of public servants from which sub-magistrates are selected.

(b) The appointments specified have been made; but the Government have no reason for thinking that the claims of men better qualified for the post of sub-magistrate have been overlooked.

(c) The Government know of no reason why they should take the action suggested.

Selection of lower revenue subordinates for upper clerical grade

* 1511 Q.—SYED TAJUDIN SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to call for and lay on the table all the Government Orders and Board's Proceedings issued for the guidance of Collectors from 1925 up to 1927 December in regard to the selection of lower revenue subordinates for upper clerical grade and deputy tahsildars in the Tamil districts, especially Tanjore Collectorate, if any, and to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the vacancies in the upper clerical grade of the Revenue and other Secretariats of the Government office and the office of the Board of Revenue are preferentially confined to qualified graduates and undergraduates;

(b) why this principle was not followed strictly in many southern district mufassal collectorates, especially in the case of Brahmans and other higher non-Brahman castes not lacking in suitable qualified B.A.'s and F.A.'s;

(c) whether the Government are aware of the fact that in the Tanjore establishment lists of 1925 to 1927 several matriculates were pushed up to the upper clerical grade vacancies thus prejudicing the chances of many good qualified senior non-Brahman B.A.'s and F.A.'s of more than fifteen years' good service in the lower clerical grade and whether the Government propose to have them all cancelled and redistributed to B.A.'s and F.A.'s;

27th February 1928]

(d) whether it is a fact that the Government are contemplating the revision of the time-scale of pay into two grades, viz., Rs. 35-3-80 and Rs. 75-7½-150 per mensem in all the mufassal collectorates, especially in heavy deltaic districts like Tanjore; and

(e) whether the Government are aware of the fact that the matriculates were appointed as acting head clerks on Rs. 90 per mensem, and as acting deputy tahsildars on Rs. 160 per mensem, in the Tanjore district and whether the Government will be pleased to have this sort of preferring matriculates to available senior B.A. and F.A. clerks cancelled in all the mufassal collectorates hereafter?

A.—The whole question appears to be based on the assumption that superior academical qualifications entitle the possessor to preference in promotion to the upper grades of the clerical service and to the deputy tahsildari. This is not the case. The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer given to the question No. 1188 (2) (b) asked by him at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 5th November 1927. There are no orders as suggested in the opening part of the question and there is no proposal as suggested in clause (a).

Village Establishments

Appointment as postmaster of the village munsif of Vishamangalam.

* 1512 Q.—MR. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether he is aware that the village munsif is also employed as postmaster in Vishamangalam (Tiruppattur taluk);

(b) under what rules he is allowed to look after both the offices; and

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to separate the offices?

A.—(a) & (c) The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested.

(b) There is no rule prohibiting village officers from engaging in other avocations.

MR. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether both the Labour Officer and the Commissioner of Labour did not visit this part of the district?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“The hon. Member seems to refer to some other question, Sir.”

Water-rate

Baling of water from the Chetti Tangal.

* 1513 Q.—MR. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU: With reference to the answer given by Government to question No. 570, dated 18th October 1927, and to questions 972 and 973, dated 31st October 1927, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased

(1) to call for the correspondence,